

**REMARKS**

Initially, in the Patent Office communication dated July 29, 2004, the Examiner objects to the Amendment filed on May 4, 2004 alleging that it is not fully responsive because it fails to comply with 37 C.F.R. §1.111(b) because it does not include arguments pointing out specific distinctions believed to render the new claims 11 and 12 patentable over the cited art. Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's assertion.

On page 8, paragraph 3 of the May 4 Amendment, Applicants offer arguments regarding claims 3, 8, and new claims 11 and 12.

To the extent necessary, Applicants petition for an extension of time under 37 CFR 1.136. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, or credit any overpayment of fees, to the deposit account of Antonelli, Terry, Stout & Kraus, LLP, Deposit Account No. 01-2135 (referencing attorney docket no. 503.38263X00).

Respectfully submitted,

ANTONELLI, TERRY, STOUT & KRAUS, LLP



---

Frederick D. Bailey  
Registration No. 42,282

FDB/sdb  
(703) 312-6600